F

ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME 8/2/65 | DATE RECEIVED

1. PUBLICATION DATA

ERIC NUMBER ED 020236 | 2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S). 7108 | 3. IDENTIFICATION NO. N.A.

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S):
Minahan, Anne

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES XX NO ☐

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
The College Union and Preparation for Citizenship

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO XX

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☐

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:
N.A.

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL XX
FOLLOW-UP ☐

7. EDITOR(S):
N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
Association of College Unions
ORG.
Willard Straight Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE
Ithaca, N.Y.: Association of College Unions

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	57	38

INST/LOC CODE | ERIC SATELLITE CODE

II. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR
experimental study, dissertation

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)
experimental studies G-23
students Y-15 special education Y-10
extracurricular G-25 objectives P-00

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

A graduate thesis which attempts to determine whether one of the major goals of student unions, "education for citizenship," is really successful.

ERIC No. 18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

IV. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OF PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

7108

IV-7

The

College Union

And

Preparation for Citizenship

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

A study by
ANNE MINAHAN

ED000236

Assoc. of College Unions

Published by
The Association of College Unions
Ithaca, New York
1957

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE UNIONS:

"The College Union and Preparation for Citizenship" (36 pp.)
by Anne Minahan, $1.00

"Standards of Training, Experience, and Compensation
in College Union Work" (16 pp.), 50c

"Planning and Operating College Union Buildings" (28 pp.), $1.00

Proceedings of past national conferences, $1.50

"Bulletin" (quarterly), $1.00 per year

WRITE TO: EDGAR A. WHITING, SECRETARY-TREASURER, ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE UNIONS, WILLARD STRAIGHT HALL, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, NEW YORK.

FOREWORD

If one consults the introductory pages of almost any college catalogue, or the key paragraphs of its charter, he is likely to find a statement in this vein:

"The aim of the University is to equip students to grow in usefulness as citizens."

"The University is a community in which students participate as maturing and responsible members and in which they depend and enrich their resources as participants, present and future, in the larger community."

"It is the University's purpose to teach the responsibilities of the individual in a cooperative society. No teaching opportunity is lost in classes or on the campus to develop the attributes of good citizenship."

"The Institute strives to stimulate the student's appreciation of the opportunities for service to his community and to prepare him for the broader responsibilities of citizenship in a democratic society."

"A basic object of education is to make the individual a moral, intelligent, and well-informed citizen with a deep sense of his obligations to the community."

Such statements of purpose will hardly be a surprise, considering that the whole educational process in America, fundamentally, was and is intended to prepare young people for intelligent participation and effective leadership in our common life together.

Democracy, indeed, is predicated upon the universal education of its citizens. This is why, above all else, our society makes the investment it does in education.

President Eisenhower has said: "The first function of our educational system is education for citizenship."

Others speak with even greater urgency in these times when making democracy work well, and making it cherished here and throughout the world, has become a matter of surpassing necessity.

The now famous Reed report to the Citizenship Clearing House says: "If

the colleges do not succeed in training students for participation in public affairs, it may make little difference what else they do."

It is with respect to this primary purpose of the college—the training of good citizens and leaders—that a place of special usefulness has been discerned for the college union, the campus community center.

The union, as much as any college institution, can have a part in the job of enlisting every student possible in a personal concern for the general welfare—because it is a natural laboratory where all who will may join in the direction of community enterprise. If students are to be the future leaders of a democracy, somewhere they must have a chance to practice citizenship. Good citizens are not made merely by reading about citizenship in courses, still less by catalogue statements of college purpose or hopeful exhortations at commencement time. Good citizens are made by the *experience* of citizenship.

On the campus there is perhaps no better place for this experience than in the union—the campus counterpart of the civic, political, and social life of the thousands of communities into which students will move after graduation. In the college the lessons of citizenship, many believe, are often best learned where students work and play together, where they meet to discuss freely and act responsibly to solve, as members of a student community, their own group problems.

Increasingly the center line objective of the union has become this one of training students for leadership in a democracy—by providing to them the maximum means and tools for practicing leadership of their common life together on the campus, thus giving a cutting edge to the foundation work of the classroom.

The theory is that if the student learns, in his out-of-class life, the habit of volunteering to act in terms of what is best for the group, if he learns how to help make his campus community good, even though it is a special kind and he is here only a while, he may attain the practice and skill and the motivation that will help him do it again another time in another place.

This is not a new proposition in the history of education. In Britain, where a prime educational aim is to infuse students with the idea that they, not someone else, are responsible for their country, deliberate encouragement has been given to the self-directed activity of unions since the early 19th century; and so many British statesmen received their first leadership training in union debates that the Oxford and Cambridge unions have become known as "the cradle of the British parliament."

In America, over the 50 years that unions have become a familiar part of the college scene, there have been recurring, reassuring evidences that there may be a relationship between leadership in the union as a student and leadership in community life as a graduate. Union leaders have turned up in notice-

able numbers as chairmen of civic organizations, leaders of community and alumni activity, members of government boards and commissions, and candidates for public office. Almost every union has received letters from former student chairmen at not infrequent intervals which read somewhat as follows:

> *"I know that in my case the Union outranks all of the other training I received in terms of influencing my life. My appetite for my present work in the community service field clearly stems from my experiences at the Union."*

The accumulation of such expressions over the years, coupled with the realization of the historic role of unions in Britain, led the national Association of College Unions to declare in 1956, as part of its basic statement of union purpose: "The union serves as a laboratory of citizenship, training students in social responsibility and for leadership in our democracy."

And now Columbia University, impressed by the potentialities of a union as a training ground for civic leadership, has taken the ultimate step of naming its proposed new union the "Columbia College Citizenship Center," saying in its announcement:

> *"The Center will serve as the 'capitol' of the forthcoming citizenship training program of Columbia College.*
>
> *"The proposed program has as its purpose the elimination of the common attitude of the college undergraduate that he should isolate himself from the affairs of his community while attending college. Through this program our students will, in a program devised and administered by themselves, have a chance to develop the habit of 'good citizenship' in the affairs of the college community as well as their own home community."*

But the question in all this which will occur to everyone is: "Granted the theory is good, how do we know that it works? Do we have any evidence that the union is preparing, or can prepare, students in social responsibility and leadership? How do we know that anything happens to a student by way of union leadership experience that wouldn't have happened anyway, or that doesn't happen to other students by way of *their* campus experience? What is the outcome when *all* student leaders in the union are considered; may we not err in generalizing from a few shining, but isolated, examples?"

To test the theory, to learn as well as one can what happens, was the object of a recent study at the University of Wisconsin. It is the first documentation of the relation of union leadership expreience to post-college civic and political activity. The results, related in the pages to follow, are indeed encouraging—though it is apparent there are many opportunities for the union which are still to be cultivated.

This study, of course, was made of the graduates of a single institution.

It does not say that a carryover of leadership in college union affairs to post-college life happens elsewhere, or happens as a matter of course. It does say that it *can* happen, because it *has* happened, at least in this instance. It reminds the union that it can relate what it does to the things that matter most. It reminds the college that it may have a vast unused resource in carrying out its continuing central and transcending purpose: the making of effective citizens.

Consider the gain if the unions and the colleges of the country, by developing their union potentials, help see to it that thousands upon thousands of students leave our doors more socially minded, ready and able to serve the common welfare, contributing freely to the imperative cause of a successful, respected democracy.

PORTER BUTTS
Director of The Wisconsin Union
and Division of Social Education

The Relationship of Union Committee Experience At the University of Wisconsin To Post-College Citizenship

A graduate thesis study

by

ANNE MINAHAN

Social Director, Wisconsin Union, University of Wisconsin

A summary and interpretation

The statement of "The Role of the College Union" adopted by the Association of College Unions as a basic description of Union purpose and function cites as one of the four main purposes of a college Union:

". . . The Union is part of the educational program of the college.

"As the center of college community life, it serves as a laboratory of citizenship, training students in social responsibility and for leadership in our democracy."

Almost very college and university similarly gives as one of its main purposes the training of useful and effective citizens, with emphasis on leadership training for community, political, and vocational service.

If a college Union is to carry out its own declared purpose and to justify its existence as an educational institution contributing to the goal of its college, it would appear it must be more than a "service station" for the campus.

Just how much of a contribution does a college Union make, or can it make, to the development of active and effective citizen-leaders?

Some observers are inclined to assume that, of course, activity leaders—whether Union, student government, Y.M.C.A., publication, or fraternity—will naturally be leaders of post-college community activities. "We see it happening all the time; this is to be expected, because a process of preselection of students of natural leadership ability brings them into positions of campus leadership in the first place."

* *For the complete statement see page 32.*

On the other hand there are many who believe that activity experience, including Union activity experience, does *not* materially affect the participant's later civic and community interests or his effectiveness as a leader any more than the general college experience affects other students; some believe, indeed, that extra-curricular activity is busy work and that it detracts from the more solid preparation for future personal effectiveness and community interests provided by the classroom; at least, they have not been aware that Union activity experience contributes much of anything.

So this study was undertaken at the University of Wisconsin to determine whether this major goal of Unions, "education for citizenship," really works, and to find out what it is that can be rightly and as objectively as possible be said in this matter, rather than just relying upon assumptions that Union activity experience will, or will not, result in a better post-college showing.

The study approached the problem by trying to find answers to the following questions:

1. Do students who lead Union activities in college participate more actively in civic organizations than students who were not active in the Union?
2. Are graduates who were active in the Union in college more active politically than other graduates?
3. Do students who lead Union activities learn more skills and techniques in college that enable them to become effective participants in their communities than do students who were not active in the Union?
4. What phases of experience in college, if any, of former Union leaders contribute most to job effectiveness, personal interests or avocations, and to civic and community interests?
5. What value do graduates attribute to college extra-curricular activities?
6. What things do graduates feel should be stressed in college extra-curricular activities?

LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

This study is not an attempt to make a subjective evaluation of the worth of the community activity in which graduates are engaged or to evaluate the quality of the graduates' contribution to community activity. Such an evaluation would necessitate contact with persons in the community who could give fair appraisals of the graduates and the worth of their service.

This study does not purport to be a comparison of one leader group with another, but rather a comparison of a Union activity group with a matched cross-section of all Wisconsin students. Because of the nature of the study as an exploration of Union activity values, it did not undertake to learn what might be the outcomes of campus leadership experience in student govern-

ment, publications, Y.M.C.A., fraternities, etc., but only to compare results for the Union group with a cross-section of university students, so that the Union and University administration could see what usefulness and potentialities the Union experience, as such, offered.

This study cannot say with certainty what motivates a person to engage in activities in college or his community. The results perhaps will not prove or disprove that a person who becomes active in the Union while in college will thereupon be motivated to become active in his community. But the study can throw light on whether or not there is reason to believe that college Union participation is the kind of participation which seems to accompany or encourage later citizenship activity (and not discourage later activity, or operate as an indifferent factor), and whether or not college Union activities teach skills and techniques and attitudes that are helpful in community life. The study can also discover if Union activity is a favorable setting in which to develop further those citizenship interests and motivations which college students may already have.

Beyond this, the study is an attempt to determine and compare (1) the college activities in which Union student leaders and other students, representing a cross-section, participated; (2) the community, civic, and political activities former Union leaders and the cross-section group have engaged in or are now engaged in, and (3) the opinions of former Union leaders and the cross-section group on the value of college extra-curricular activities.

METHODS

THE SAMPLE

Perhaps the most reliable method of determining what students, formerly active in the Union, are doing in their communities and what they think of their college activity experience would be to interview them all personally. However, difficulties of time, personnel, and expense made this procedure impossible for this study.

The Union has mailing lists of all past Union officers, chairmen, and club presidents from 1908 when the Union organization started, up to the present time. (The present building was completed and opened in 1928). These are the former leaders of the Union. Questionnaires completed by these former Union leaders would give, of course, an indication of the scope of their post-college activities. But questionnaires from Union leaders alone would not indicate how they differ, if at all, from other more typical graduates of the University of Wisconsin. In order to determine if there is a difference between Union leaders and a cross-section of all other students, information from a control group of other graduates is necessary.

Therefore, the decision was made to poll by mail former Union leaders and a matched group of other Wisconsin graduates. If this mailing were to include all former Union leaders and a control group, approximately 1000 graduates would have to be included. It was felt that a representative 40% sample of the total group would be adequate.

A sample of 206 Union leaders was drawn to include *all* Union officers and committee chairmen in the following year groupings:

1920-1926 Before the Union building was constructed and a full time Union staff was employed
1931-1934 Depression years
1938-1941 So-called "normal" years
1942-1945 War years
1947-1950 Post-war years

(It should be noted here that the Union chairmen and officers do not constitute a group of students whose leadership talent was already established before entering Union activity. Committee membership has always been open freely to all who wished to apply. Many students had no previous activity experience or any special predilection for activities; they were urged to apply

by friends, or were simply curious. For the most part chairmen were then selected from the committee membership on the basis of interest and demonstrated ability. In some cases chairmen were recruited from among students who had had no previous Union experience and little experience in other campus activities—especially during the war years).

The Wisconsin yearbook, *The Badger*, which lists all university graduates, was used to select the control group, or cross-section sample. The graduate in the *Badger* alphabetically closest to a Union leader of the same university major and same sex was chosen for this control group. The selection was done in this manner because students in the same major tend to have a similar class schedule, spend a similar amount of time in class, and have similar vocational interests; and because activity interests of women as compared to men are subject to similar variations both in college and out of college. In selecting the control group, the decision was made to omit consideration of the amount of time students spent in paid jobs because a student leisure time survey made at Wisconsin in 1934 indicated that the amount of hours a student worked in college did not materially affect his college activity participation.

Most of the students in the control group were not devoid of campus activtiy. Many of them were campus leaders in other activity; many were members of campus committees; only a few (17% of those who returned questionnaires) had no campus activity. Thus, a comparison of the two samples, Union and other graduates, is not a comparison between a leader and non-leader group, but rather a comparison of Union leaders and a group which represents a true cross-section of university graduates—both leaders and non-leaders.

DESIGNING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Items on the questionnaire were designed to verify the identity of the respondent's name, maiden name, year of graduation, and University major.

Items on number of years at the University of Wisconsin in Madison, marital status, number and ages of children, and occupational information were included, to determine if the two groups varied significantly in these factors, which might have an influence on civic participation.

A section on participation in campus activities was included. In this section the graduates were asked to give the names of organizations and committees to which they belonged and the positions they held in the activities.

A section asking respondents to indicate where they lived in school and what offices they held in their living units was included to determine if there was any significant difference between the campus residences of the Union group and control group which might affect interest in or training for civic participation.

A section on post-college activities was designed to determine to what general types of community organizations respondents belonged, and the offices or positions they have held.

A section on political activity was included to determine the number of graduates in both samples who participated as citizens in the voting booth, in a political party, and as candidates for election. The questions were designed to obtain specific answers and not generalities. Thus, the respondents were asked if they voted in the *last* election and not if they voted regularly.

To determine what things graduates think they learned from activities and what things they think should be stressed in activities, a check list of items was devised. These items included:

Experiences that former students have cited in letters to the Union staff as valuable to them.
Experiences that former students have said they missed in activities.
Items mentioned by respondents in other similar studies.
Items suggested by Wisconsin Union staff members.

In order to determine what college activities respondents felt were most helpful to them in their civic and community interests, effectiveness on a job, and personal interests and avocations, a question was included asking them to rank under each such post-college experience the activities which contributed the most.

Finally, an open-end question on the value of college activities was included to allow the respondents to state their own views freely.

A draft of the questionnaire was mailed to ten University of Wisconsin graduates of varied ages and campus activity background as a pilot study. Utilizing their suggestions for clarification of the questionnaire, a final draft was completed.

MAILING

As it was felt that any identification of the mailing with the Union might prejudice the answers of the respondents, a general covering letter was prepared on University of Wisconsin stationery. Professor A. H. Edgerton of the University of Wisconsin School of Education signed the letters. For purposes of the mailing, the study was designated "Student Activity Research Project." *The survey was not identified with the Union in any way.*

170, or 82.5%, of the *Union* graduates and 175, or 85%, of the *non-Union* graduates returned the questionnaire.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TWO GROUPS

No major differences were found to exist between the groups of respondents in the number of years they spent at the University of Wisconsin, marital status, number and ages of their children, or their present occupation—all factors which might have influence on civic participation.

(a) *Average Number of Campus Activities*

All the *Union* groups of the years selected, male and female, averaged more activities than the *non-Union* group. The average number of college activities for the *Union* graduate was 5.5 as compared to 2.6 for the *non-Union* graduates. The *Union* men graduates averaged 5.2 activities; the *non-Union* men averaged 2.6 activities. The *Union* women graduates averaged 6 activities; the *non-Union* women, 2.5.

(b) *Average Number of Campus Positions*

The *Union* graduates far outnumber the *non-Union* graduates in the number of positions they held on campus. Of course all the Union respondents were "activity chairmen" in college, and in this category the Union sample far outnumbers the non-Union sample. Alumni in the *Union* sample of 170 held 324 positions of chairman, board members, and vice-presidents in college, as opposed to 62 such positions held by the 175 alumni in the *non-Union* sample. In the total *Union* sample there were 117 presidents or editors or business managers, as compared to 37 presidents or editors or business managers in the *non-Union* sample.

The average number of positions held by the *Union* graduate is 3.2 per person, and .9 per person for the *non-Union* graduates. Within the total Union sample the averages of the different year groups are very similar. The averages of the different year groupings are also very similar in the total non-Union sample.

(c) *Campus Living Units*

The most striking difference in the two groups is shown in the figures for place of residence (Independent Houses and Fraternities and Sororities). The total *Union* sample spent an average of .9 years in Independent Houses as opposed to the *non-Union* group which spent an average of 1.4 years in Independent Houses. Almost twice as many *Union* graduates belonged to fraternities as did *non-Union* graduates. The total *Union* sample spent an average of 1.5 years in Fraternities or Sororities as opposed to .8 years for the *non-Union* group. The differences in these two categories is even more marked when only the men are considered. The *Union* men spent an average of 1.7 years in the fraternities and the *non-Union* men .9 years. The *Union* men spent an average of 1.1 years in Independent Houses and the *non-Union* men an average of 1.8 years.

The differences between the Union and non-Union groups in relation to other types of campus living (i.e., dormitories, own home) is slight.

FINDINGS

POST-COLLEGE COMMUNITY ACTIVITY

Students, both men and women, who were active as committee chairmen or officers in the Union do participate more actively in civic organizations than students who were not active in the Union. (This applies to the graduates from every year except for the graduates of 1920-1926, the years before the Union building was constructed).

Table 1 indicates the post-college participation by Union and non-Union graduates in community organizations.

Table 1: Post-College Participation in Community Activities By Union and Non-Union Graduates

	UNION (*170 graduates*)		NON-UNION (*175 graduates*)	
Community Activity	**Rank**	**% Participating**	**% Participating**	**Rank**
Vocational Organizations	1	56.5%	46.3%	1
Community Service	2	54.1	43.3	2
Church-related	3	44.1	40.	3
School-related	4	40.	29.1	4
Arts	5	34.7	19.4	10
University-related	6	32.4	26.9	5
Civic Improvement	7	30.6	24.	7
Service Clubs	8	28.8	21.1	8
Youth Organizations	9	25.3	25.7	6
Veterans Groups	10	20.6	21.1	9
Other (unclassified)	11	14.7	14.3	12
Political Action (non-partisan)	12	13.5	12.6	13
Health Services	13	11.8	6.3	14
Women's Clubs	14	11.8	14.9	11
Village, City, State Board and Commissions	15	10.6	3.5	16
International Relations	16	9.4	5.7	15
Interracial Relations	17	3.5	2.3	17
Aid to Foreign Born	18	.6	1.1	18

More graduates in both groups participate in vocational, community service, and church and school-related organizations than in any of the other types of community organizations. But more than 20% more *Union* graduates

participate in vocational, community service, school-related, and University-related organizations than *non-Union* graduates.

10% more *Union* graduates than *non-Union* graduates are in church-related organizations.

80% more *Union* graduates than *non-Union* graduates are in art organizations.

40% more *Union* graduates than *non-Union* graduates are in service clubs.

Three times as many *Union* graduates have been members of village, city, and state boards and commissions (though the number of both Union and non-Union groups understandably is small, due to the relatively limited opportunities for service on elective and appointive bodies as compared to open membership or volunteer organizations).

The differences between the participation of the two groups is relatively small in other organizations, or in some cases (notably international relations, interracial relations, and aid-to-foreign born organizations) the number of graduates who participate is so small in both groups that the differences between the groups do not seem very significant.

However, in every type of organization or service except youth groups, aid-to-foreign born, and women's clubs, more *Union* graduates do participate than the *non-Union* graduates. Even if some of the differences may not be large, the consistency of higher participation by the Union graduates seems significant.

Average Number of Community Activities

The *Union* graduates average 6.6 community activities per person, and the *non-Union* graduates 5.1 activities per person. The averages for the men are 6.3 for the *Union* men and 4.8 for the *non-Union*. The averages for the women are 7.4 for the *Union* women and 5.7 for the *non-Union* women.

The *Union* graduates average more community activity in every year grouping than the *non-Union* graduates except the graduates from 1920-1926, the years before the building was completed. These Union graduates average 6.5 activities as compared to 8.5 for the non-Union graduates. The most recent graduates (1947-1950 in both samples), who have had relatively few years in which to join community activities, naturally average fewer activities than any of the other year groupings.

4.7% of the *Union* graduates have participated in no activity, compared to 9.1% of the *non-Union* graduates.

Number of Positions in Community Organizations

Union graduates have held an average of 4 offices or positions in community organizations as compared to 3.3 offices or positions held by *non-Union* graduates. The *Union* respondents in all the year groupings, except

1920-1926, have held an average of more positions than the *non-Union* respondents. In the 1920-1926 group the *Union* respondents have held an average of 4.4 positions as compared to 7.2 positions for the *non-Union* graduates.

The *Union* respondents have held more of every kind of position in community organizations, except "chairman," than the *non-Union* respondets. (Youth leader figures are too close to constitute a real difference).

Community positions in order of their frequency for the two groups are:

Union	Number	Non-Union	Number
Board Member	133	Board Member	109
Solicitor	121	Solicitor	95
Chairman	118	Chairman	140
President or Top Position	107	President or Top Position	88
Other Job	93	Other Job	67
Active Committee Member	67	Active Committee Member	44
Youth Leader or Teacher	42	Youth Leader or Teacher	43

52% more *Union* graduates than *non-Union* graduates have been active committee members in their community organizations; 38% more *Union* graduates than *non-Union* graduates have held "other" or unclassified jobs in their communities; 27% more *Union* graduates than *non-Union* graduates have been solicitors in their communities; around 22% more *Union* graduates than *non-Union* graduates have been board members and president (or top jobs) in community organizations. The graduates' participation as youth leaders or teachers is similar in both groups. Only in chairmen positions do *non-Union* graduates have an edge over *Union* graduates; 18% more *non-Union* graduates have been chairmen in community organizations than *Union* graduates.

Only 16.5% of the *Union* graduates have held no positions as compared to 26.3% of the *non-Union* graduates.

On the whole, Union graduates have held more positions than the non-Union graduates. 58.2% of the *Union* graduates have held three or more positions as compared to 42.3% of the *non-Union* graduates. Most of the year groupings show this type of variance between the Union and non-Union graduates. Exceptions are:

Only 59.1% of the *Union* graduates of 1920-1926 have held three or more positions as compared to 76% of the *non-Union* graduates.

The depression year *Union* graduates, 1931-1934, out-distance the *non-Union* graduates of the same period more than any other Union graduates in the other year groupings out-distance their control groups. 83.7% of the depression years *Union* graduates have held 3 or more positions as compared to 50% of the *non-Union* graduates.

College Fraternity Membership and Community Activity

It was indicated earlier in this report that almost twice as many Union

graduates, especially men, belonged to fraternities and sororities in college than did the non-Union graduates. In an attempt to discover if membership in a fraternity or sorority might influence community activity as much or more than the Union, the respondents were studied in relation to fraternity membership and community activity. The results follow:

	% Who Participate in 6 or More Community Activities	
	Fraternity-Sorority Members	*Non-Fraternity*
Union group	55.8%	62.7%
Non-Union group	49.3	29.8

As will be seen above, both fraternity and non-fraternity members of the *Union* respondents participate in more community activities than either the fraternity or non-fraternity members of the *non-Union* respondents, which would indicate that college participation in the Union is more influential than participation in fraternities and sororities in furthering post-college community activity.

When community interest and leadership is measured in terms of holding office in community organizations it is found that the number of non-fraternity and non-sorority graduates of the *Union* group who held three or more offices slightly exceeds the number of fraternity and sorority graduates in either the *Union* or *non-Union* groups as well as far exceeding the non-fraternity and non-sorority graduates of the *non-Union* group.

Again it is apparent that the high percentage of fraternity and sorority members in the Union group is not the factor that accounts for the better showing of Union graduates in community participation.

POLITICAL ACTIVITY

Graduates, both men and women, who were active in the Union in college are somewhat more active politically than students who were not active in the Union. (This applies to the graduates from every year grouping).

More *Union* graduates (87.6%) vote in local elections than *non-Union* graduates (78.9%). More *Union* graduates (90.6%) vote in state elections than *non-Union* graduates (82.3%). Slightly more *Union* graduates (95.9%) vote in national elections than *non-Union* graduates (94.3%).

The *non-Union* graduates of 1947-1950 are the only non-Union graduates in all the year groupings who have a better national voting record than the *Union* graduates of their same years: 97.5% of these *non-Union* graduates voted in the last national election as compared to 87.8% of the *Union* respondents.

More graduates in both samples voted in the national elections than in state elections, and more in state elections than in local elections.

14.7% of all the *Union* graduates are dues-paying members of a political party, compared to 13.1% of the *non-Union* graduates. The differences between the two samples is very slight in all the year groupings except in the 1920-1926 years; 36.4% of these *Union* graduates are dues-paying members of a political party as compared to 16% of the *non-Union* respondents.

More *Union* graduates (20.6%) have campaigned actively for candidates or for a political party in local elections than have the *non-Union* graduates (12.6%). More *Union* graduates (12.9%) campaigned in state elections than *non-Union* graduates (9.7%). However, more *non-Union* respondents actively campaigned for candidates or for a party in the last national election (26.9%) than did *Union* respondents (21.8%). This is accounted for by the fact that 74.4% of the *non-Union* graduates in the 1938-41 year grouping campaigned as compared to 25.6% of the *Union* graduates. In the case of all other year groupings a higher percentage of *Union* graduates campaigned actively than did the *non-Union* graduates.

40.6% of the *Union* respondents made a monetary campaign contribution in the 1952 election as compared to 26.9% of the *non-Union* graduates.

More than twice as many of the *Union* graduates (10%) have been candidates for office than the *non-Union* graduates (4.6%). The difference is greatest among the 1931-1934 graduates; 18.9% of these *Union* graduates have been candidates for office as compared to 2.7% of the *non-Union* graduates, or more than six times as many.

WHAT STUDENTS RECEIVED OR LEARNED FROM COLLEGE ACTIVITIES

A large proportion of all graduates of the survey say they learned in campus activities values and skills of the kind which have use and significance in post-college community participation. *Table 2* shows, however, that this was much more true of the *Union* respondents than the *non-Union*.

Table 2: Relationship Between Union and Non-Union Graduates and the Order of the Things They Say They Received or Learned From College Extra-curricular Activities

	UNION (*170 graduates*)		NON-UNION (*175 graduates*)	
Benefit	**Rank**	**% Receiving Benefit**	**% Receiving Benefit**	**Rank**
Opportunities for getting acquainted with fellow students	1	91.2%	76.6%	1
Personal leadership of a program or event	2	81.8	45.7	9
Understanding of other people's point of view and motives	3	78.2	66.9	2

Training in conducting good business meetings	4	73.5	42.3	12
A variety of activity experience	5	72.9	44.6	10
Understanding of purpose of activity	6	71.8	52.	5
Training in delegating responsibility	7	68.2	37.7	14
Methods of program planning and organization	8	67.4	36.6	15
Training in communicating ideas	9	62.4	55.4	3
Guidance on "how to do it" from staff and faculty	10	60.6	34.9	16
Methods for attacking probblems	11	58.2	51.4	6
Importance of routine work	12	58.2	52.6	4
Financial responsibility	13	55.9	46.9	7
Methods for conducting group discussions	14	55.3	38.3	13
Publicity and promotion techniques	15	54.1	28.	21
Roberts Rules of Order	16	50.	29.1	19
Record keeping	17	47.1	46.9	8
Relation of campus activities to post-college activity and jobs	18	45.3	33.7	18
Budget making	19	44.1	29.1	20
Training in presenting an organized argument for a point of view	20	41.8	43.4	11
Training in effective organization of personal time	21	40.6	33.7	17
Evaluation of activities to improve operation and programs	22	37.1	17.1	24
Interview skills	23	33.	21.1	23
Evaluation of student's personal contribution to activity	24	27.6	17.1	25
Received little or no assistance from staff and faculty	25	27.1	25.7	22

As the above table shows, 75-80% more *Union* graduates than *non-Union* graduates say they received or learned:

Personal leadership of a program or event
Training in conducting good business meetings
Methods of program planning and organization
Training in delegating responsibility
Publicity and promotion techniques
Evaluation of activities to improve operation and program

50-75% more *Union* graduates than *non-Union* graduates say they received or learned:

A variety of activity experience
Guidance on "how to do it" from staff and faculty
Roberts Rules of Order
Budget making
Evaluation of student's personal contribution to activity

25-50% more *Union* grduates than *non-Union* graduates say they received or learned:

Understanding of purpose of activity
Methods for conducting group discussions
Relation of campus activities to post-college activity and jobs
Interview skills

About 20% more *Union* graduates than *non-Union* graduates say they received or learned:

Opportunities for getting acquainted with fellow students
Financial responsibility
Training in effective organization of personal time

Only with respect to the item, *Training in presenting an organized argument for a point of view*, do more *non-Union graduates* (43.4%) than the *Union* graduates (41.8%) indicate they received help.

In the remaining six items there is little difference between the two samples.

When men and women are studied separately, the same pattern of difference between *Union* graduates and *non-Union* is apparent. The main exceptions are:

More than 60% more *Union* women than *non-Union* indicate that they learned *Financial responsibility*, while the difference between the men's group and the total is slight.

There is almost no difference between the *Union* and *non-Union* women in the items, *Opportunity for getting acquainted with fellow students* and *Understanding of other peoples' point of view and motives*, while the total figures indicate that around 20% more *Union* graduates learned these values than *non-Union*.

The results depicted in *Table 2* would seem to indicate that students active in Union work have a greater opportunity to receive or learn advantages through campus activity that will benefit them in their after-college life than students who are not active in the Union.

INFLUENCE OF THE UNION

These general findings on the relationship of Union participation to things learned were further emphasized when the graduates were asked to rate the campus activities in which they participated in order of their importance

as a contribution to their "Civic and Community Interests," "Effectiveness on a Job," and "Personal Interests or Avocations." (Again it should be recalled that the survey was not identified with the Union in any way, and that the Union graduates averaged 5.5 campus activities and held 3.2 positions as chairmen or officers, so Union leaders on the average had at least three to five opportunities for a learning experience through campus activities and might have indicated any one of five activities as an influence).

Only 14.9% of the *non-Unon* sample identified any activity as a contribution to the three areas of post-college activity, so an analysis of their opinions is not feasible.

On the other hand, 70% of the *Union* respondents rated their activities by name. Some did not do a complete rating job, and some of them did not rate at all, but enough did rate to make a comparison feasible.

(a) *Civic and Community Interests*

47.1% of the *Union* respondents said the Union was first in importance as a contribution to their Civic and Community Interests—ten times the number that rated any other college activity first. More men than women rated the Union first. 30% of the *Union* respondents did not rate their college activities at all in this category. The remaining 22.9% varied widely in their answers; "Student Government" and "other or unclassified" activity received the second highest rating with 4.7% apiece.

53.5% of the *Union* graduates did not specify any activity in second place as a contribution. 12.9% (22 graduates) placed the Union in second place. 11.2% (19 graduates) placed "other or unclassified" activity in second place. The other second place ratings were small and widely spread. 62.9% of the *Union* respondents did not rate any activity in third place. 7.1% (12 graduates) placed the *Union* in third place. The other third place ratings were small and widely spread.

(b) *Effectiveness on a Job*

48.2% of the *Union* respondents placed the *Union* first in importance as a contribution to their Effectiveness on a Job—almost seven times the number that specified any other activity as a top ranking contribution. 28.8% did not rate at all. "Other or unclassified" types of activity ranked second with 7.6% and "Publications" ranked third with 7.1%.

56.5% of the *Union* respondents did not rate any activity in second place. 14.7% (25 graduates) ranked the Union second; 11.2% rated "other" in second place. The other second place ratings were small and widely spread. 78.2% of the Union sample did not rate activity in third place. Of those

who rated, 7.1% (12 graduates) placed the Union in third place. The other third place ratings were small and widely spread.

(c) *Personal Interests or Avocation*

27.6% of the *Union* respondents rated the Union in first place as an important contribution to their Personal Interests or Avocations—more than four times the number that rated any other activity first (Dramatics, 5.9%). More women than men rated the Union in first place.

63.5% of the *Union* respondents did not rate any activity second in this category. 14.7% (25 graduates) did rate the Union second, and 8.2% rated "Other or unclassified" second. 85.3% respondents did not rate any activity in third place. 4.1% (7 graduates) placed the Union third, and 3.5% placed "other or unclassified" activity third.

It is evident that the Union made an almost equal contribution to Civic and Community Interests (47.1% rated the Union first) and to Effectiveness on a Job (48.2% rated the Union first), and a smaller contribution to Personal Interests or Avocations (27.6% rated the Union first). And in all cases the Union, in the view of the respondents, exceeded the contribution of all other activities taken together. In short, the *Union* leaders, though engaging in an average of 5.5 different college activities, rather readily identified the Union as the major source of the experiences that benefited them most in their post-college activities. On the other hand, the graduates of the survey who did not participate in Union leadership could not identify, for the most part, any specific activity experience as a contribution to their post-college interests, even though they averaged 2.6 activities in college per person.

While observers connected with the Union might hope and even expect that Union activity leaders would count the Union as a prime contributing factor to their learning experience, they have previously had no sure way of knowing that this was so. Considering that the present study was not identified with the Union in any way, the spontaneous responses of the Union graduates specifying the Union, out of three to five options, as the most important contribution to their post college interests and effectiveness now serve to give reassurance that the Union's time, effort, and money working with student committees is well spent.

GENERAL VALUES OF COLLEGE EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Table 3 indicates what the graduates of the survey answered when asked the open-end question "In your opinion, what value, if any, do college extra-curricular activities have?" Almost all of the graduates who answered the

question in both groups feel that activities are of great value (96.2% Union and 92.5% non-Union graduates)

Table 3: Relationship Between Union and Non-Union Respondents and What They Think Are the Values, If Any, of College Extra-curricular Activities

	UNION (*159 graduates responding*)		NON-UNION (*159 graduates responding*)	
Value of Activities	**Rank**	**% Citing Value**	**% Citing Value**	**Rank**
In general, definite value	1	96.2%	92.5%	1
Learning to work and get along with people and learning to understand others' points of view	2	45.9	32.1	2
Help students develop a philosophy of life and maturity	3	18.9	9.4	6
Give graduates a sense of responsibility toward their community and skills and talents which enable them to be effective participants in their communities	4	14.5	13.8	4
Develop organiaztional ability	5	13.8	6.3	10
Broaden span of interests and hobbies	6	12.6	15.1	3
Leadership training	7	12.6	9.4	7
Develop sense of responsibility	8	12.6	3.8	14
Meeting people of different college majors	9	10.1	5.7	11
Help develop skills and talents useful on a job	10	9.4	10.7	5
Exchanging of ideas and opinions with others	11	7.5	5.7	12
Enjoyment of college life	12	6.3	3.1	15
Opportunities to make friends	13	5.	4.4	13
Social contacts	14	5.	8.8	8
In general, no value	15	3.8	7.5	9

The answers from the Union and non-Union graduates were very similar in kind. The main differences were quantitative:

More *Union* respondents throughout discerned each kind of value except in three cases (notably "Social Contacts").

Although both groups cited mosted frequently the value of activities in providing an opportunity to learn to understand and get along with people, 45.9% *Union* graduates mentioned this in comparison to 32.1% of the *non-Union* graduates.

18.9% *Union* respondents cited the development of maturity and a philosophy of life as an important value of activities; 9.4% *non-Union* respondents listed this.

More than twice as many *Union* respondents mentioned development of organization ability and more than three times as many *Union* respondents referred to development of a sense of responsibility.

Twice as many *non-Union* respondents saw no value.

The graduates' personal point of view, and the nature of the influence of his college activities, is best revealed in the voluntary responses received.

(a) *Union Respondents*

The comments varied from two words, "much value," to two typewritten sheets.

153 (96.2%) of the respondents felt that campus activities were of definite value.

A typical answer, this one from a housewife and former teacher, reads:

> "Actually the successes I've had in my work and in my life I feel are traced directly to the activity opportunities I had as a student."

Another housewife writes:

> "The value of extra-curricular activities can never be underestimated because, in effect, they prepare one for the outside world. On a smaller scale, one can practice all the necessary techniques, exchange of ideas, working with a group, leading a group, meeting people from many backgrounds and forming one's opinions and philosophy of life. In college this experience can be gained while still keeping a form of guidance. In many instances this knowledge has proven for me to be more valuable than the actual course knowledge taught formally."

Many singled out the Union for special praise. One graduate writes:

> "I would certainly recommend that the undergraduate participate in some kind of activity, especially activity in the Wisconsin Union. The staff members have a way of seeing to it that the student is well prepared for many situations that might arise later in life."

Only 6 graduates (3.7%) indicated that they were sorry they had participated in activities and felt they had learned little from them.

The value derived from activities which was mentioned most frequently by the Union graduates was learning to work and get along with people and learning to understand others' point of view. 73 respondents (46%) mentioned this. An attorney writes:

> "Activities teach us to work with people—which is more important after graduation than is the formal education."

A regional sales manager writes:

> "In my opinion their (activities) only real value is training in

how to get along with people and I rate this as 50% of the value of college education."

And a professor writes:

> "One of the most important factors in any vocation is the human element—our relationship with other people. Whether it be an appreciation for their point of view or just an ability to get along with them more harmoniously, I believe that extra-curricular activities do make a real contribution to the participant. One cannot begin to get the effect of interaction of personalities on ideas in the formal and restrictive atmosphere of the classroom which is obtained in the informal situation of extra-curricular activities. My own prejudices were eliminated to a very major degree in the course of my working in extra-curricular activities with those about whom I had built up prejudice."

In a similar vein, 16 graduates stressed the important contribution activities made in bringing together people of different college majors. An editor of a business publication writes:

> "Student Union experience was particularly valuable in providing opportunity to organize activities. It was also a group drawn from rather different spheres of college life, as opposed to many groups which are dominated by one school. Extra-curricular activities should give the econ man a change of scenery, a chance to meet an engineer, say. The bringing together of people with different talents, interests and training is likely to benefit all hands far more than just meeting people in the same old line. Such experience would certainly be beneficial in modern industry, which makes constant use of the conference technique."

8 graduates simply listed opportunities to make friends as an important value in extra-curricular activities, and 8 graduates felt that social contacts made in college were valuable.

The second value of activities mentioned most frequently was their contribution in helping students develop a philosophy of life and general maturity. 30 graduates (19%) included this in their answer. Similarly, 12 graduates felt the exchanging of ideas and opinions which help form personal beliefs was one of the values of college activities.

A research analyst writes:

> "Activities brought me in contact with students of various interests and my best memories are of the wonderful 'bull sessions' in the Rathskeller. A free exchange of opinions and the atmosphere of toleration of differences were present at Wisconsin during my college years. That was a fine training ground for testing of ideas."

20 graduates felt that college activities had broadened their span of interests, talents, and hobbies and thus were contributing to their enjoyment of living.

23 graduates said they felt campus activities had given them a sense of responsibility toward their community and had gvien them skills and talents which enabled them to be effective participants in their communities. Specific talents and attitudes mentioned were:

20 graduates simply said "leadership training"

19 graduates said activities had given them a "sense of responsibility"

22 graduates cited "organizational ability"

Others mentioned "public speaking," "Roberts Rules of Order," "publicity and promotion techniques," and "financial responsibility."

15 graduates said they had learned skills and talents in activities that had helped them on their job.

10 graduates cited enjoyment of college life as a value of activities.

Some graduates compared the value of activities to classroom work. 6 graduates felt that activities were over-stressed and classroom work thus suffered. 10 graduates felt that activities were as important as classroom activity. 9 graduate felt that activities were of more value than classroom work. One such graduate, a manager of a building and construction firm, writes:

> "It was through the contacts of my fraternity and my Union activities that I received training which in many ways has possibly been of more value than actual classroom experience. This social experience probably enabled me to adjust to the depression into which the class of '32 graduated, and to three different vocations since that time."

Some of the graduates were embarrassed they had not participated more actively in their communities since leaving college and cited time-consuming jobs, living abroad, and time in military servce as reasons for their lack of participation.

(b) *Non-Union Respondents*

159 (90.9%) of the *non-Union* respondents answered the question, "In your opinion, what value, if any, do college extra-curricular activities have?

23 of the respondents started their answers by saying they wished they had participated more. A recreation worker writes:

> "If there was just one chance to do it all over, my record of those activities would be 100%—they give the student so much of life in such a pleasant and easy manner. While some students work to gain the utmost from their class work, others join many groups and activities, and still learn many different phases of the life that will follow in their work and community living."

Many cited reasons why they had not participated in campus activity.

7 said they were too poor, were working their way through college, and thus had no time for activities. 2 said they were too busy with school work. 12 people said they were shy, were given no encouragement to participate, or "knew no one." 7 who said they didn't know where to begin in activities felt that the faculty should seek out people who need extra-curricular activity and encourage them to participate.

All but 12 of the respondents felt that campus activities have value. A typical answer comes from a manager of a general food corporation who says:

> "They compose the biggest factor in making me the extravert my job requires. They give additional experience at an early age in organizing yourself within an organization. They provide further insight in the problems of adult group living. They arouse an interest in community life. They make a great contribution to becoming a well rounded citizen. Some activities brought me in close contact with people whose attitudes and philosophy were entirely different than mine. My college career probably was a constant compromise with the formal learning side, but never with the responsibilities alloted me in extra-curricular activities. I hope that my son has the same attitude with, perchance, a slightly larger interest in the books. My reason for this is simple—things I learned from participating in extra-curricular activities are paying off for me at the pocketbook level as well as making my life today happier and better adjusted."

One geologist, an oil producer and rancher from Texas, was extremely dubious about the value of activities. He writes:

> "They're fine if not at the expense of studies and friendships. I didn't have time for them. One of the extra-curricular stars of my time is in Houston, Texas, today. He has the seat out of his pants. Two or three years ago when Wisconsin played Rice at football this man was wearing his fraternity pin and talking about 'the Big Red Team.' I wonder if the extra-curricular interests couldn't wait until one is out of school."

As was true of the *Union* respondents, the value most frequently mentioned by the *non-Union* respondents was learning to work with people and learning to understand their points of view. 51 respondents (32%) cited this as a major contribution of activities. Similarly, 9 graduates mentioned the value of activities in bringing together people from different spheres and majors of college life. 7 graduates mentioned meeting new friends, and 14 respondents cited social contacts and social development as important values.

The value mentioned second most frequently (24 respondents) was increasing and broadening fields of interests and hobbies. A sixth grade teacher writes:

"In my case, association and work for the International Club determined a lifelong interest in promoting international understanding wherever the opportunity comes my way—through teaching, friendships, travel and several positions I have held in international organizations."

15 respondents felt that activities had helped shape their philosophy of life and given them maturity, and 9 respondents felt that an important value of activities has been the opportunity to exchange ideas which helped them form their own beliefs.

22 graduates felt that activities had given them a greater sense of responsibility to participate in community activity. A newspaper reporter writes:

"The valuable lesson is 'If I don't do it, it won't get done.' Four years ago I became a member of a labor union with a long standing record of achievement. I thought it would be possible simply to join and expect that the persons who had always run the union in the past would continue to do so. Inside of three years I learned that the continuing success of the group depended on my contribution as much as theirs. Three years ago I joined a newly organized church here, and the point was made even clearer. There were no 'bearded' elders and deacons which in the past I had always depended upon to run the church. If the job was going to be done, I had to do it. The decisions that must be made by the president and secretary of state in these times staggers the imagination. How forcefully the thought must come to them that if peace is going to be saved, they must save it. I don't think there is any greater lesson that extra-curricular activities can teach."

Like the Union graduates, some of the *non-Union* graduates cited attitudes and talents they had learned in college that were helpful in community life:

15 people mentioned "leadership training," and 10 graduates "organizational ability."

6 respondents cited "learning to accept responsibility."

Other skills and talents listed were "Roberts Rules of Order" and "publicity and promotion techniques."

17 graduates felt that activities had helped them on their job. A department store buyer writes:

"First of all, my own college activities played a vital part in my obtaining my first job. The firm by which I have been employed since that time seemed to believe that if people took part in more than just the academic life of the school, they would be more adaptable to the varied nature of the work in merchandising. Serving as a chairman of a group and coordinating its activities can very well be a training ground for leading or supervising people in a job situation. My own activities

helped to give me self-confidence in working with people and to be better prepared for organizing projects assigned to me as part of a job. We now have people come into our organization as recent college graduates and it is most interesting to see the differences in the way they react, according to the preparation they have had, not only in their studies but in activities as well. Your questionnaire may serve yet another purpose—it appears to be time for me to make more of a contribution to the community than the vacant spaces indicate."

"Enjoyment" was listed by 5 respondents as an important value of college activities.

Some of the *non-Union* respondents compared campus activities and classroom work. 5 people felt that activities were a detriment to intellectual achievement; 5 felt they were as important as classroom work.

THE THINGS THAT GRADUATES FEEL SHOULD BE STRESSED IN COLLEGE EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Table 4 shows what the Union and non-Union graduates think should be stressed in college extra-curricular activities, from the vantage point of their post-college experience. The two groups are in close agreement, and the number who favor each item is very high (more than 50% in every case but one).

Table 4: Relationship Between Union and Non-Union Graduates and the Order in Which They Rank the Things They Believe Should Be Stressed in College Extra-curricular Activities

	UNION (*170 graduates*)		NON-UNION (*175 graduates*)	
Item to Be Stressed	**Rank**	**% Citing Item**	**% Citing Item**	**Rank**
Understanding of other peoples' point of view and motives	1	94.7%	92.0%	1
Training in delegating responsibility	2	91.2	89.7	2
Training in communicating ideas	3	90.	88.6	3
Methods of program planning and organization	4	89.4	80.	9
Opportunities for getting acquainted with fellow students	5	88.8	84.	5
Training in effective organization of personal time	6	88.2	82.9	7
Understanding of purpose of activity	7	85.9	81.1	8

Training in conducting good business meetings	8	85.3	80.	10
Methods for attacking problems	9	84.1	83.4	6
Financial responsibility	10	82.4	78.9	12
Personal leadership of a program or event	11	82.4	79.4	11
Methods for conducting group discussions	12	81.1	78.3	13
Training in presenting an organized argument for a point of view	13	81.1	86.3	4
A variety of activity experience	14	72.9	73.7	16
Evaluation of activities to improve operation and programs	15	72.9	66.3	18
Relation to campus activities to post-college activity and jobs	16	72.4	74.3	15
Guidance on "how to do it" from staff and faculty	17	69.4	76.6	14
Record keeping	18	68.2	66.9	17
Budget making	19	66.5	64.	19
Importance of routine work	20	64.1	59.4	20
Publicity and promotion techniques	21	56.5	50.3	24
Evaluation of student's personal contribution to activity	22	55.9	54.9	21
Interview skills	23	55.3	52.	23
Roberts Rules of Order	24	51.8	53.7	22
Provide little or no assistance from staff and faculty	25	30.6	24.	25

All graduates rate *Understanding of other people's points of view and motives, "Training in delegating responsibility, and "Training in communicating ideas* as the most important things to be learned in college extra-curricular activities. Other items rank close behind.

The only items in which the two groups vary in their ranking by more than three places are:

Methods of Program Planning and Organization which was ranked 4th by the *Union* graduates and 9th by *non-Union* graduates.

Training in presenting an organized argument for a point of view which was ranked 13th by *Union* graduates and 4th by *non-Union.*

The only item that less than 50% of both groups feel should be stressed is *Provide little or no assistance from staff and faculty* (30.6% of *Union* graduates and 24% of *non-Union* graduates), which would seem to indicate that most students, at least upon retrospection, *want* staff-faculty guidance,

rather than wanting to avoid it (often the popular assumption).

In the majority of cases in both samples, the percentage of graduates who think an item should be stressed in college is much greater than the percentage of graduates who say they actually received or learned this value or skill, as shown by *Table 2*.

In the *Union* sample, in only 8 categories did the number who say they received a helpful experience approach within ten percentage points the number who say the same experience should be stressed, these items thus standing out as a kind of measure of the adequacy of the *Union's* present success in training:

Opportunities for getting acquainted with fellow students
Personal leadership of a program or event
Importance of routine work
A variety of activity experiences
Guidance on "how to do it" from staff and faculty
Provide little or no assistance from staff and faculty
Publicity and promotion techniques
Roberts Rules of Order

In the *non-Union* sample, in only 3 categories did the number who received or learned benefits approach within ten percentage points of the number who felt the same item should be stressed:

Opportunities for getting acquainted with fellow students
Importance of routine work
Provide little or no assistance from staff and faculty

From the above it is evident that the *Union* group came closer to receiving from their activity experience what they now think should be stressed than did the *non-Union* group.

However, it is also apparent that many of the *Union* graduates say they did *not* learn the things in college that they now think are important to learn. *Table 5* shows the difference in what the *Union* graduates said should be stressed in college extra-curricular activities and what they actually received or learned:

Table 5: The Things That Union Respondents Feel Should Be Stressed in College Activities and the Things They Say They Received or Learned In College

	Should Be Stressed	Received or Learned
	(170 Union respondents)	
Understanding of other people's point of view and motives	94.7%	78.2%
Training in delegating responsibility	91.2	68.2
Training in communicating ideas	90.	62.4
Methods of program planning and organization	89.4	67.4
Opportunities for getting acquainted with fellow students	88.8	91.2
Training in effective organization of personal time	88.2	40.6
Understanding of purpose of activity	85.9	71.8
Training in conducting good business meetings	85.3	73.5
Methods for attacking problems	84.1	51.4
Financial responsibility	82.4	55.9
Personal leadership of a program or event	82.4	81.8
Methods for conducting group discussions	81.1	55.3
Training in presenting an organized argument for a point of view	81.1	41.8
A variety of activity experience	72.9	72.9
Evaluation of activities to improve operation and programs	72.9	37.1
Relation of campus activities to post-college activity and jobs	72.4	45.3
Guidance on "how to do it" from staff and faculty	69.4	60.6
Record keeping	68.2	47.1
Budget making	66.5	44.1
Importance of routine work	64.1	58.2
Publicity and promotion techniques	56.6	50.3
Evaluation of student's personal contribution to activity	55.9	27.6
Interview skills	55.3	33.
Roberts Rules of Order	51.8	50.
Little or no assistance from staff and faculty	30.6	27.1

As previously pointed out, the number of *Union* graduates who said they actually received or learned what they felt should be stressed is in close balance in only 8 out of twenty-five items. In the remaining 17 items, the number of graduates who feel an element of training should be stressed in college extra-curricular activities is much greater than the number who say they actually received or learned such training in college.

In the 10 items that *Union* graduates rated as most important to receive or learn in college:

More than twice as many said that *Training in effective organization of personal* time should be stressed as said they learned this in college.

64% more said that *Methods for attacking problems* should be stressed in college than those who said they learned this.

45% more said that *Training in communicating ideas* should be stressed than those who said they learned this.

30% more said that *Training in delegating responsibility, Methods of planning and organization, and Financial responsibility* should be stressed than those who said they learned these values and methods.

Around 20% more said that *Understanding of purpose of activity* and *Training in conducting good business meetings* should be stressed than those who learned this.

In the remaining two items in the top 10, *Opportunity for getting acquainted with fellow students* and *Personal leadership of a program or event,* the number of graduates who felt that these should be stressed is close to the number who say they received or learned such opportunities.

Thus, although the findings show that many more *Union* graduates than *non-Union* graduates have learned values and methods from college activities that they feel should be stressed, there are many areas that apparently have not been stressed enough at Wisconsin and should be emphasized more with present and future students if a training job more satisfactory to the graduate is to be done.

The items listed in *Table 5* as important values to be stressed in college activities may also serve as a useful guide to others in developing their training programs.

INTERPRETATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

What can we conclude from the findings of the survey? The findings indicate:

1. *Union* graduates, regardless of sex, place of college residence, present occupation, marital status, or year of graduation are more active participants in their communities and are more active politically than a cross section of graduates without Union experience. The only exceptions are the *Union* graduates of 1920-1926, the years before there was a Union building and staff, who are less active in their communities than are the *non-Union* graduates of these years.

2. Many more *Union* graduates than *non-Union* graduates say they have benefitted from their college activities and they identify the Union as the activity that made the most important contribution to their civic and community interests, their effectiveness on a job, and their personal interests or avocations.

What are the differences in activity experiences between *Union* graduates and *non-Uunion* graduates? Three things stand out:

1. The *Union* graduates had a building, the Union—the campus community center—with a wide range of useful facilities.

2. The *Union* graduates are known to have had very substantial responsibility in planning within the building a social, cultural, and recreational program for the campus. The final decisions in programming rest with students. The responsibilities of the cross section, or control, group were fewer (less activities) and in most cases, even for the "leaders" in this group, not as heavy or direct.

3. The *Union* graduates had a Union staff to serve them as program advisors, counselors, teachers, and friends. Twice as many *Union* graduates as *non-Union* graduates say they received guidance from staff and faculty in their college extra-curricular activities. At Wisconsin, the Union is the only student activity (except perhaps for the religious organizations) that throughout the years (except the early 1920's) has had an active full-time advisory staff working closely with students and aiding them in their personal development, leadership training, and in their programming plans and ideas.

The only group of *Union* graduates who had *no* building in which to work and received *no* full-time staff guidance was the group of 1920-1926, and these are the only graduates who are lower than the *non-Union* graduates in community participation.

In reading this report, one may well wonder if a better post-college showing by students who chaired key campus activities, which by their nature may have attracted students of native leadership ability and strong motivation to participate in community affairs, isn't just what might be expected, and that the reason for a better showing isn't therefore an original pre-selection of leadership talent. But here, in the case of Union chairmen of the 1920's, we have a total Union chairman group, in office before Wisconsin had a Union building and an advisory staff, that did *not* perform nearly as extensively or as well after college as the ordinary cross-section of students, or average, of the same era, or as well as the later Union chairmen who did have a building and an advisory staff; here we have an activity leader group for which the results were not "what might be expected." In other words, it would appear that just being an "activity leader"—even a Union chairman—working in a vacuum and without guidance does not necessarily promote the cause of good citizenship. In the natural speculation over whether a college activity leader group wouldn't, as a matter of course, out-perform a matched cross-section of graduates in post-college community activity, it seems rather significant that a Union activity leader group without the tools and resources of a building to work with, and without the guidance of an advisory staff, should rate so much lower in post-college community interests and performance than either their contemporaries (the "cross section" or control group) or the succeeding Union activity people who did have a building and an advisory staff. Lending confirmation to the importance of staff guidance is the fact that the Union graduates of 1931-1934, who, as it happened, had the most staff guidance, are the highest of any year group in community participation and are comparatively higher than the *non-Union* graduates of the same years than holds true in any other year grouping.

It would seem that the combination of good physical resources and real student responsibility for the direction of campus activity programs, accompanied by friendly staff coaching and guidance, can make the difference between meaningful and educational student activities and less fruitful college activity. And graduates in both groups under study, *Union* and *non-Union*, seem to agree,—seven out of ten stating that guidance from staff and faculty should be stressed in college extra-curricular activities.

The record of achievement of Union leaders is not perfect; it can be improved especially in certain types of community participation, in political

activity, and in the learning they receive in their college activities.

While *Union* graduates average 6.6 post college community activities per person and *non-Union* graduates average 5.5, very few graduates (less than 10% in either group) participate in organizations concerned with international relations, inter-racial relations, and aid to foreign born. True, many small communities may not have organizations concerned with these problems. But, if universities and college Unions wish to activate interest in students in international and inter-racial areas which may have a carry-over into later life, it would appear that they should work to expand programs such as international clubs, human relation's committees, mock United Nations conferences, forums and discussions dealing with international and inter-racial questions, cultural programs designed to present different world cultures, and other similar programs.

Although the record of political participation of *Union* graduates is slightly higher than *non-Union* graduates, the findings show that less than half of the *Union* graduates and less than a fourth of the *non-Union* graduates have campaigned actively for a candidate or party or made a monetary campaign contribution. If universities and Unions wish to fulfill more completely their aim of developing active citizens, it would seem that Unions should expand programs on public affairs forums and discussions, mock political conventions and elections, and other such programs.

Lastly, since both Union and non-Union graduates almost unanimously agree there *are* important values in extra-curricular activities; since many graduates (especially non-Union graduates), from the vantage point of experience, discern values and skills which they believe worth stressing but which they themselves did not learn; and since there is general agreement on what should be stressed, Union staff members and other university personnel concerned with extra-curricular activities should endeavor to ensure that the students with whom they work do have the opportunity to receive or learn the things that graduates feel are important, and would do well to encourage students not heretofore active to participate fully.

As stated earlier, the results of this study may not prove or disprove that a person who becomes active in the Union while in college will therefore be motivated to become active in his community. But it does appear clear that Union activity, in general, accompanies and even encourages later citizenship activity; further, that Union leaders, in contrast to other students, say after graduation they learned many skills and attitudes which have been helpful to them in their after-college life—and that for the most part they learned them through their Union experience.

Union activity does, indeed, stand out as a favorable setting in which to develop further those citizenship interests and motivations which college

students may already have. But it should be reiterated again, based upon the Wisconsin findings, that a significant Union contribution to the college's central purpose of training useful, effective citizens is likely to occur only if students have good tools and resources to work with in the form of a reasonably adequate Union building, if they have real responsibility, and if there is also an adequate, well prepared staff of counselors who recognize the importance of training students in social responsibility and the importance of teaching students the values and skills that are useful to citizens in community life.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The results of this study apply only to leader-graduates of the Union at the University of Wisconsin. Studies done at other college Unions are needed to verify whether or not Union leader-graduates elsewhere are also more active in their communities than a cross section of their fellow graduates.

This survey dealt only with Union chairmen, and not students who were only *members* of Union committees. A survey of committee members would indicate if Union experience significantly benefits other Union activity participants as well as those in chairmanship positions.

A survey matching Union chairmen and another group made up only of students in leadership positions might highlight further the possible effect a Union advisory staff and the responsibilities of a Union program may have on activity graduates.

The Role of the College Union

A statement of purpose, adopted by the general membership of the Association of College Unions at the national conference, April, 1956

1. The union is the community center of the college, for all the members of the college family—students, faculty, administration, alumni and guests. It is not just a building; it is also an organization and a program. Together they represent a well-considered plan for the community life of the college.

2. As the "living room" or the "hearthstone" of the college, the union provides for the services, conveniences, and amenities the members of the college family need in their daily life on the campus and for getting to know and understand one another through informal association outside the classroom.

3. The union is part of the educational program of the college.

As the center of college community life, it serves as a laboratory of citizenship, training students in social responsibility and for leadership in our democracy.

Through its various boards, committees, and staff, it provides a cultural, social, and recreational program, aiming to make free time activity a cooperative factor with study in education.

In all its processes it encourages self-directed activity, giving maximum opportunity for self-realization and for growth in individual social competency and group effectiveness. Its goal is the development of persons as well as intellects.

4. The union serves as a unifying force in the life of the college, cultivating enduring regard for and loyalty to the college.